



Board

Present Janet E. Jackson, Chair
Present Brooke Burns
Absent Mark Fluharty
Present Dr. Chenelle Jones
Present Willard McIntosh, Jr.
Present Pastor Richard Nathan
Absent Kyle Strickland
Absent Rev. Charles Tatum
Present Aaron Thomas
Present Mary Younger

Guests

Absent Lara Baker-Morrish
Absent Richard Blunt
Present Colleen Dunne
Present Jeffrey Furbee
Present Kate Pishotti
Present George Speaks
Absent Robert Tobias
Present Commander Mark Lang
Present Lt. Justin Coleman
Present Jen Grant

MEETING MINUTES

WELCOME

At 2:08pm, Chair Janet Jackson welcomed the Columbus Civilian Police Review Board ("CPRB") to the meeting.

Chair Jackson informed the Board that since their last meeting, Dr. Medina-Cortes has resigned due to a conflict of interest with her employer. The Mayor's office is already interviewing replacement candidates, and hopes to have a new member in place at the December meeting.

Dr. Chenelle Jones was contacted by someone on LinkedIn who wanted to ask her questions about the Inspector General job. Chair Jackson suggested that members of the Board should not respond to these types of inquiries.

Pastor Rich Nathan asked if the Board had a quorum present. Chair Jackson confirmed there were seven members present, more than meeting the minimum for a quorum.

Mark Fluharty is ill and Kyle Strickland had a Covid exposure and is being cautious. Both absences are excused. Rev. Tatum was not present and Chair Jackson will contact him.

DIRECTOR CLARK INTRODUCTION

Chair Jackson asked each Member present to introduce themselves to Director Robert Clark of the Department of Public Safety, then gave him the floor. Director Clark thanked the Board for their service, stressing the importance of transparency and accountability.





APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

Pastor Nathan motioned to approve the October meeting minutes, and Willard McIntosh seconded. The minutes were approved by a unanimous vote.

IDENTIFICATION OF COMMITTEES AND MEMBERS

Chair Jackson introduced the committees, chairs and members. Several vacancies were left for the future 11th Board Member to fill. The Community Engagement and Training and Education committees will each have five members, meaning Chair Jackson cannot sit in on committee meetings due to public meeting rules. These committees will likely meet during future board meetings so that all board members may participate, due to the large amount of interest.

- Training and Education
 - Dr. Chenelle Jones, Chair
 - Kyle Strickland
 - Mark Fluharty
 - Willard McIntosh, Jr.
 - Vacancy
- Community Engagement
 - Mary Younger, Chair
 - Aaron Thomas
 - Willard McIntosh, Jr.
 - Rev. Charles Tatum
 - Pastor Rich Nathan
- Rules and Regulations
 - Brook Burns, Chair
 - Mark Fluharty
 - Vacancy
- Nominating
 - Rev Charles Tatum, Chair
 - Aaron Thomas
 - Vacancy
- Standards of Professionalism
 - Pastor Rich Nathan, Chair
 - Kyle Strickland
 - Brooke Burns

If any other committees are deemed of interest by any Board Members in the future, they should be brought to Chair Jackson.





REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON MEDIA INQUIRIES

This committee met on November 1st, and Chair Jackson was in attendance. Chair Jackson asked Dr. Jones and Pastor Nathan to provide an update to the Board.

Dr. Jones explained Brooke Burns and Pastor Nathan brought language to the committee regarding the issue of Board Members speaking to the press not reflecting the views of the Board in its entirety or impartiality. The committee agreed with some of the language, but had concerns it was not all-encompassing. The committee needs to review the language and revisions before they will be prepared to present final suggested language to the Board. They are trying to create parameters for Board interactions with the media.

Pastor Nathan agreed with Dr. Jones and mentioned the perception of the Board in the mind of the community – the previously proposed language described interacting with city officials, but didn't address the public interactions or perceptions. The public doesn't often distinguish between a Board Member speaking as an individual vs as a representative of the Board. The guidelines have to protect 1st amendment rights and professional roles of Board Members while also preserving the impartiality of the Board.

During the committee conversation, the idea was raised of a facilitator being available in the future to help coach Board Members on media interactions. Dr. Jones has a colleague who is potentially available to help with this. Chair Jackson requested the draft language be sent to the full board prior to the next board meeting.

THE ABC'S OF POLICING

Chair Jackson asked to confirm situational training and ride alongs had been completed. Colleen Dunne confirmed the situational training was complete, and George Speaks informed the Chair only one member has yet to do a ride along. Chair Jackson shared that her ride along was largely uneventful, but she had a great conversation with the officer and she found it enjoyable and informative.

Chair Jackson welcomed the CPD officers back to continue the ABC's of Policing.

Commander Lang informed the Chair that the formal presentation was complete, but that they were happy to continue the conversation and answer questions for the Board.

Chair Jackson explained that the scenario training was completely different from the last time she took it.

Aaron Thomas asked the officers about a situation with a baton during which the officers at the academy mentioned different levels of tools. He requested a list of these tools.

Commander Lang explained the Use of Force Continuum – an officer should generally react to certain situations in certain ways. An officer wouldn't pull a firearm just to speak to an individual, but an officer





wouldn't be expected to say "please stop" to an active shooter. There is a fluid spectrum of response behavior.

Lt. Coleman elaborated that there are eight different levels, and officers are not required to start at the beginning, nor do they have to go from 0 to 1 to 2, etc. Level 0 is simply officer presence, and Level 5 involves use of an impact weapon, and so on. Subject factors include the proximity of a weapon, level of injury, environmental factors, the number of subjects/number of officers, etc. Level 5 is appropriate when physical force is being used against the officer, in the specific example Mr. Thomas mentioned. Lt. Coleman reviewed the various scenarios which the Board Members experienced, and asked Mr. Thomas what prompted him to select the baton in his training.

Mr. Thomas mentioned the training scenario from the October CPRB meeting, and mentioned how uncomfortable he was pointing a gun at someone due to his upbringing. He explained the training officer was surprised Mr. Thomas always aimed for the leg in the scenarios, as opposed to the torso. Mr. Thomas described an article about a Sheriff training officers to aim for the leg, and asked whether that is something the CPD would consider incorporating into their standard practice.

Commander Lang agreed the goal to shoot the leg is noble, and that killing less people is preferred, but CPD officers are not encouraged to do this if the person has a gun. He reminded the group that someone shot in the leg can still move. Legs are smaller targets, and realistically, under stress, officers won't always hit the smaller target. This is something the training division will look at, but he wouldn't expect to see it become the future of training. Commander Lang added that the sheriff Mr. Thomas read about has put this into training but not changed policy – that's not how things work in Columbus. It would have to be a policy change before CPD would train that way.

Mr. Thomas mentioned the Board can review policies, and suggested they might choose to look at this policy in the future.

Ms. Burns asked how many hours cadets spend in scenario training and what proportion of scenarios require Level 5 or higher force. Commander Lang explained the State of Ohio requires five to ten scenarios throughout training, and only one that necessitates use of the baton. CPD does about 120 scenarios, and the vast majority do not require the type of physical force described. He suggested around ten would be expected to end with physical force. Most have human contact but very few end in force. Lt. Coleman added that each individual's perceptions, comfort level, and other factors will affect their response to a given scenario. Scenarios can require different levels of force depending on the individual's response.

Ms. Burns asked about cadets consistently using higher levels of force than required and what consequences or coaching they would receive. Commander Lang described debriefs after each scenario where trainees' performance is reviewed. Some of the state-mandated scenarios have pass/fail requirements, and if someone fails repeatedly it can lead to termination from the academy. Lt.



Coleman added that some scenarios do not require any use of force, and if trainees use force in that situation, they fail.

Mary Younger asked how officers are trained once they finish their initial academy training. Is there a review once a year or biannually to include new tactics/procedures? Are they retrained, and can you (leadership) keep an eye on individuals to monitor their behavior?

Commander Lang informed the group that most years there's a day of training on physical skills like baton usage (required by the accrediting body) and more scenarios. The training division tries to stay current and provide training as needed. This is typically conducted once a year in the fall for one full day (8 hours.)

Ms. Younger asked about how officers receive feedback. Commander Lang explained that if two officers went on a run together, they'd get their feedback together immediately following the scenario.

Lt. Coleman added that supervisors conduct reviews constantly throughout the year. There's an early warning process regarding use of force, which happens automatically. Every officer has a 90-day performance evaluation prior to their anniversary of service, plus an annual review. They're ranked on interpersonal skills, judgement, etc. Performance plans are created for those who score low on these reviews. There are continuing education credits throughout the year covering anything that would change policies or techniques.

Ms. Younger inquired when complaints are filed by the public and deemed unfounded, are those ever reviewed? Commander Lang assured her that, yes, they are reviewed annually along with the officer's performance. Complaints in aggregate are useful feedback even if deemed unfounded.

Mr. Thomas mentioned that the new Chief is incorporating chaplains at crime scenes – what other mental health supports are being offered to officers? Commander Lang discussed the Peer Assistance team, made up of other officers who are specially trained to provide help. The City has an Employee Assistance Program with trained psychiatrists. Officers can go on their private time or while on duty. In regards to the chaplain program, the chaplains represent the division and help at the scene of a crime, or are available internally at any time. Lt. Coleman elaborated that support for officers has grown and expanded. The Division of Fire has done this for years, and Police has adopted what they were doing. Several Sundays ago there were 9 shootings, it was a very trying day for everyone, but he had to notify families of two suicide victims. One of the suicides occurred in front of officers. CPD has to ensure they're not sending officers back out without making sure they're mentally okay. There is also a therapy dog unit which recently trained 14 new dogs with the county. These are available for officers who need relaxation and a break.

Chair Jackson mentioned the Safety Advisory Commission's recommendations included several regarding officer wellness. Kate Pishotti reminded the Board that there is a Police and Fire wellness



center under construction now which will include all of these resources and should be open by March of 2022.

Lt. Coleman added that the CPD is becoming more cognizant of what citizens and officers need as a result of traumatic situations. Commander Lang replied that discussing wellness internally has allowed officers to see what resources are available for them and for the community.

Pastor Nathan asked about a central database of officer discipline, is that data available? How many officers are in service right now? Commander Lang answered just under 1900. Pastor Nathan stated that it would be nice to see a picture of how many of those 1900 experienced discipline – perhaps see a bell curve of performance. What does the CPD look like in terms of officer performance?

Deputy Director George Speaks mentioned that the annual use of force report is published on the website. Internal Affairs also publishes an annual report which is available online. Mr. Thomas requested a copy of these reports.

Chair Jackson mentioned it would be helpful to get an overview of the whole department to gain a greater understanding. Mr. Thomas requested information about the reporting structure or an org chart for the CPD.

Lt. Coleman gave a quick rundown of the departmental structure, and Commander Lang explained that the Division's annual report contains that information as well.

Chair Jackson asked about the last or next annual report. Commander Lang explained the last annual report came out about two months ago, and the next use of force report should be coming out soon.

Chair Jackson requested each of these reports be shared with the Board as they are available, and questioned how many Deputy Chiefs, Commanders, and Lieutenants there are. Commander Lang counted 1 chief, 1 assistant chief, 6 deputy chiefs, 18 commanders, 52 lieutenants, and ~225 sergeants

Ms. Younger wondered if this departmental structure is standard across the US. Commander Lang stated that another department might have more assistants or might have corporals, but would be generally similar. Ms. Younger questioned the reason for this structure. Was it chosen for its efficiency? Commander Lang stated that as the department is over 200 years old, he can't speak to that. Regarding span of control – if one person has too many direct reports, they can't manage everyone. CPD tries to keep the number of direct reports to a point where they can be adequately supervised. Lt. Coleman added that they used to have Captains, but don't any longer. Deputy Director Speaks informed the Board that in the 1800's in England, Robert Peale (the father of modern policing) wanted to distinguish himself from the military, and wore blue to contrast redcoats. That's where modern policing was born. Additionally, all reports discussed previously are on the city website.

Ms. Burns asked about the number of people being actively supervised in relation to field training – while new graduates are in their field training, what's the command structure? Commander Lang





explained that each new officer is assigned to a single field training officer at a time. One to one. During the training they'll have 4 different field training officers, to ensure personality conflicts don't keep people out of the job, and the trainees see different parts of the city.

Dr. Jones asked how field training supervisors are selected and what kind of training they go through. Commander Lang stated that they have to have been an officer at least 4 years, have no sustained departmental charges or current investigations, and be recommended by chain of command. There's a general knowledge test and a practice presentation they do. If they pass all of those, they are selected and do a 1 week/40-hour course on learning theory, paperwork, ratings, and they do in-service training every year. Lt. Coleman added that they're directly reviewed by their supervisors as well, so there are two forms of oversight.

Mr. Thomas asked where the horseback officers fit into the structure of the Division. Commander Lang mentioned that one of the cool things about a horse is that people want to approach them. It's a great tool for community relations. Lt. Coleman added that they're useful for seeing over crowds.

Dr. Jones asked if it was a possibility to do a fly-along as well as a ride-along. The officers indicated this was a possibility. Commander Lang asked if any other members wanted a second ride along – Mr. Thomas and Ms. Younger indicated interest.

Chair Jackson opened the floor for additional questions, and there were none. She thanked the officers for their time.

Chair Jackson suggested the Board take a break and then reconvene to discuss any new business.

BREAK

Chair Jackson brought the Board back to order and reviewed agenda items for upcoming meetings.

- December
 - Jeff Furbee will cover relevant constitutional and case law
 - Lieutenant Justice – de-escalation
- January
 - Implicit Bias training
 - Committee report outs
- February
 - DEI and Cultural Competency
- Media inquiry coaching (TBD)

Regarding committees, Chair Jackson suggested the Chairs will set the meetings, and after the initial meeting each group should share basic overview with the full Board. Meetings can be informal, and





must be less than 6 people. There is language in the bylaws regarding committees for reference. Chair Jackson would like each committee to meet at least once before the January CPRB meeting. Board members agree this is feasible.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Jackson asked for a motion to adjourn at 3:53pm. Dr. Jones moved, Ms. Younger seconded. Unanimous vote to adjourn.

